UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,877	05/10/2001	David L. Biddulph	23140.00001	5171

7590   11/05/2003

John Christopher, Esq.
CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Blvd.
Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *amendment dated 9/12/2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

This is in response to the amendment dated September 12, 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1-34 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-9, applicant argues on pages 9-10 that Sehr does not disclose an information-gathering system that includes "a ballot-intent verification system to allow the user to confirm that the customized represents accurate user intent". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sehr silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. Sehr discloses the voting template, which corresponds to the ballot, displays on the computer screen (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Sehr) and display choices for the user to select (see Fig. 4 of Sehr) or make his or her choices that he or she is going to input into the computer. It is obvious that the user must check input information and the computer system has to provide an option for the user to revise input to approach to final change in order to get his or her original intent.

Furthermore, examiner maintains that a computer generated display inherently offers a user the ability to easily edit or modify a display on the screen. This ability has in large been the driving force behind the almost universal adoption of the computer as the preferred means of word processing or data entry via filling out a form or template.

Regarding claim 3, applicant argues on page 10 that the "unique identifier" of Applicant's invention distinguishes from the "secret certification number" in Sehr. Examiner assures that their functions are the same and they are both for the purpose of gaining the access to the system. For example, Sehr teaches that the certification center load the secret certification

number into the voting card that is unique (see col.7, lines 55-58, Sehr) and this unique number

assign to "particular voter" (see step 206, Fig.7, Sehr) to gain the access (see col.5, line62 to

col.6, line 31, Sehr).

Regarding claim 6, applicant argues on page 10 that Sehr does not describe "a tabulation

database accessible by the validated user via the unique identifier". Examiner respectfully

disagrees. Sehr clearly teaches the "tabulation database" which accessible by the user and store

the user information (see element 20, Fig.1 and col.4, line 62 to col.5, line 9, Sehr).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, applicant argues on page 11 that Sehr does not disclose "a

system that allows the validated user to access the tabulation database via communication

network". Examiner respectfully disagrees. The system of Sehr clearly that the system allows the

user to access the tabulation database (see col.4, line 62 to col.5, line 9, Sehr) and this computer

system can configured as client-server networks (see col.5, lines 9-15, Sehr). Sehr further

discloses that the voting activities can be performed at a user's computer and on-line

communication network (see col.6, lines 61-64, Sehr).

Regarding claims 10-11, 20, 23 and 30-33, applicant argues on page 11-13 that neither

McClure et al. nor Sakai et al. discloses or suggest "an information-gathering system that

includes a user-intent verification system to allow the user to confirm that the cast ballot

represents accurate user intent". In response, this argument is already discussed above on claims

1-9.

Regarding claims 21-26, applicant argues on page 12 that Sehr does not disclose or

suggest the step of "causing the unique identifier to be printed on the receipt and the official

ballot". Examiner respectfully disagrees because Sehr and McClure combination discloses the

claimed limitation. As discussed above on claim 3 that Sehr teaches a certification center, act as

a database administration, assign a secret certification number, which corresponds to the unique

identifier, for particular user to access and joint the voting activity. McClure, on the other hand,

discloses what is well known in the art to use the printer and scan to print out records for specific

event during the election (see col. 15, lines 50-52 and col. 20, lines 54-56, McClure). Therefore,

the combination system of Sehr and McClure can print out records and any unique number on

the receipt and the ballot during the election.

Regarding claims 12-19 and 28-29, applicant argues on page 13 that none of the cited

references discloses the step of "confirming that the second tangible record (i.e., the customized

ballot represents accurate user intent" and "assigning a unique identifier to the user". In response,

this argument is already discussed above on claims 1-9 and 3.

Applicant made no further remark. For all the reasons discussed above, rejection to all

claims is maintained using the references of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. In particular, "the unique identifier accessible only to the validated user

to allow for confidential verification of the integrity of the validated user's response" the user

can not verify the system, the user can ask for the permission to access or use the system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U. S.

Patent no. 5,875,432) of record.

Regarding claim 1, Sehr discloses an information gathering system, comprising:

-    at least one computer (see col. 5, line 2, Sehr);

-    an identification database accessible by the computer, the identification database

     including user identification information (see col. 4, lines 56-61 and col.5 lines 24-

     27). "Certification center database" (30, Fig.1, Sehr) corresponds to "identification

     database";

-    at least one output device coupled to the computer (see col. 5, lines 15-18, Sehr); and

-    a software component executable by the at least one computer (col. 5, lines 43-47,

     Sehr), the software component being arranged to validate the user and cause the

     computer to provide output on the output device corresponding to a customized ballot

     prepared based upon a validated user response to a specified request for information

     (see col. 4, lines 24-27 and col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 9, Sehr). "customized ballot"

     corresponds to particular user voting campaign; and

Sehr does not explicitly disclose "a user-intent verification system to allow the user to

confirm that a recorded vote database represents accurate user intent". Sehr, however,

discloses the voting template, which corresponds to the ballot, displays on the computer

screen (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Sehr) and display cloices for the user to select (see Fig. 4

of Sehr) or make his or her choices that he or she is going to input into the computer. It is

obvious that the user must check iput information and the computer system has to provide

an option for the user to revise input to approach to final change in order to get his or her

original intent. Therefore, Sehr silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to user

the system of Sehr to generate a specialized system because it would allow the user to

confirm or revise his or her input ballot to match his or her accurate intent.

Regarding claim 2, Sehr further discloses an input device coupled to the computer

wherein the software component is further arranged to read a completed customized ballot from

the input device, check the completed customized ballot for errors and to cause the computer to

provide output to the output device corresponding to the completed customized ballot (see col. 5,

lines 1-5, Sehr). "smart card reader" (11, Fig. 1, Sehr) corresponds to "input device".

Regarding claim 3, Sehr further discloses the software component is also arranged to

assign a unique identifier to the validated user (see col. 6, lines 6-9, Sehr), the unique identifier

accessible only to the validated user to allow for confidential verification of the integrity of the

validated user's response (see col.5, line62 to col.6, line 31 and col.7, lines 54-62, Sehr).

Regarding claim 4, Sehr further discloses a forms database accessible by the computer, the forms database including form formatting and content information (see Fig. 3, Sehr).

Regarding claim 5, Sehr further discloses the forms database corresponds to an official ballot forms database (see Fig. 1). Tabulation database (20, Fig. 1) corresponds to "forms database".

Regarding claim 6, Sehr further discloses a tabulation database accessible by the validated user by verifying the unique identifier randomly generated for the validated user (20, Fig. 1, Sehr).

Regarding claim 7, Sehr further discloses the tabulation database corresponds to an official vote tabulation database (see col. 7, lines 12-20, Sehr).

Regarding claims 8-9, Sehr further discloses the validated user accesses the tabulation database via a communication network (see col.5, lines 9-15 and col. 6, lines 62-64, Sehr).

2.   Claims 6, 10-11, 20-26, 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U. S. Patent no. 5,875,432) of record in view of McClure et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,250,548) of record.

Regarding claim 10, Sehr discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except that the unique identifier is a randomly generated number. McClure, however, discloses the unique number is randomly stored in a memory location (see col. 33, lines 30-41, McClure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to randomly generate that unique number and randomly store it in the memory. The motivation of doing so would have been to authenticate the voter's identity (see col. 6, lines 6-8, McClure).

Regarding claim 11, Sehr/ McClure further discloses the specified request for information includes at least one of a request for validated user's address (see col. 3, lines 48-50, Sehr) and a request for an allowable language preference (see col. 19, lines 1-8, McClure).

Regarding claim 20, Sehr discloses a method of voting using a computer, the method comprising:

- checking the eligibility of a potential voter by accessing a voter eligibility database (see col.6, lines 19-25, Sehr);

- rejecting the potential voter who is deemed to be a non-eligible voter (see col. 6, lines 14-18 and 25-28, Sehr);

- receiving an address of an eligible voter (see col. 3, lines 48-54, Sehr);

- customizing a ballot based on a selected criteria by accessing a ballot form database (see col.3, lines 50-65, Sehr). "customized ballot" corresponds to particular user voting campaign;

- displaying the ballot to the eligible voter (see col. 6, lines 28-31, Sehr);

- receiving the ballot from the eligible voter (see col. 6, lines 35-41, Sehr);

- checking the ballot for errors by comparing the ballot to a selected standard (see col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 15 and col. 5, lines 5-9, Sehr). By checking the voting card's authenticity process, the ballot is checking for errors which is comparing the ballot to a selected standard;

- collecting the official ballot (see col. 6, lines 35-44, Sehr).

Sehr does not explicitly disclose "allowing the potential voter to confirm that the ballot represents accurate voter intent". Sehr, however, discloses the voting template, which corresponds to the ballot, displays on the computer screen (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Sehr) and display cloices for the user to select (see Fig. 4 of Sehr) or make his or her choices that he or she is going to input into the computer. It is obvious that the user must check input information and the computer system has to provide an option for the user to revise input to approach to final change in order to get his or her original intent. Therefore, Sehr silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to user the system of Sehr to generate a specialized system because it would allow the user to confirm or revise input ballot to match his or her accurate intent.

Sehr also does not disclose printing an official ballot and a stub to be retained by the eligible voter, it is well known in the art to use the printer to print out records for specific event during the election (see col. 15, lines 50-52, McClure). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the printer as an output device in the system of Sehr in order to print out voting information.

Regarding claim 21, Sehr/ McClure further discloses the method of generating a unique

identifier (see col. 7, lines 54-58, Sehr); causing the unique identifier to be printed on the stub

and the official ballot (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Sehr); updating a voting results database which

includes the unique identifier for each official ballot tabulated (col. 6, lines 35-48 and 57-64,

Sehr); providing access to the voting results database to the eligible voter; and requiring the

eligible voter to input the unique identifier in order to gain access to the voting results database

(see col. 8, lines 3-10, Sehr).

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Sehr/ McClure further discloses the specified request for

information includes at least one of a request for validated user's address (see col. 3, lines 48-50,

Sehr) and a request for an allowable language preference (see col. 19, lines 1-8, McClure).

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Sehr/McClure discloses the unique is randomly stored in a

memory location (see col. 33, lines 30-41, McClure). It is well known to randomly generate that

unique number and randomly store it in the memory to authenticate the voter's identity (see col.

6, lines 6-8, McClure).

Regarding claim 27, Sehr/McClure further discloses the first database corresponds to an

official voter registration database (see col. 4, lines 56-59, Sehr).

Regarding claim 34, Sehr discloses all of the claimed limitation as discussed above, except printed on the customized ballot and stub to allow for confidential verification of the integrity of the validated user's response without giving the validated user a physical copy of the response. Sehr does not disclose printing the customized ballot and stub. But it is well known in the art to use the printer and scan to print out records for specific event during the election as taught by McClure (see col. 15, lines 50-52 and col. 20, lines 54-56, McClure). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the scanner printer as an input and output device in the system of Sehr in order to print out voting information.

3.   Claims 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U. S. Patent no. 5,875,432) of record in view of Sakai et al. (U. S. Patent 6,047,052) of record.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Sehr discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed in claim 6 above, except that the unique identifier is a randomly generated number. But it is well know to one of ordinary skill in the art to randomly generate an identifier as evident by Sakai (col. 8, lines 59-62, Sakai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr as taught by Sakai for executing and collecting data program using the ID number (see col. 5, lines 59-64, Sakai).

Regarding claims 25-26, Sehr/ McClure further discloses receiving handicap access and receiving preferences from the voter (see col. 5, lines 48-55, McClure).

Regarding claim 30, Sehr discloses a method of voting which preserves the secrecy of the

ballot while allowing a voter to verify the integrity of a vote, comprising:

- checking the eligibility of a potential voter by accessing a voter eligibility database

  (see col. 6, lines 19-25, Sehr);

- generating and assigning a unique identifier to an eligible voter (see 7, lines 54-66,

  Sehr). "a secret certification number" corresponds to "unique identifier";

- printing a customized ballot which conforms to one or more selected criteria;

  comparing the scanned ballot with a predetermined standard to detect voter errors

  (see col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 15 and col. 5, lines 5-9, Sehr). By checking the

  voting card's authenticity process, the ballot is checking for errors which is

  comparing the ballot to a selected standard;

- collecting the official ballot (see col. 6, lines 35-44, Sehr); and

- storing the official ballot The second tangible record has been produced and collected

  during the voting process and/or survey is stored in the second database (30, Fig.1,

  Sehr).

Sehr does not explicitly disclose "allowing the voter to confirm that the completed ballot

is an accurate representation of voter intent". Sehr, however, discloses the voting

template, which corresponds to the ballot, displays on the computer screen (see col. 5,

lines 59-60, Sehr) and display cloices for the user to select (see Fig. 4 of Sehr) or make

his or her choices that he or she is going to input into the computer. It is obvious that the

user must check input information and the computer system has to provide an option for

the user to revise input to approach to final change in order to get his or her original

intent. Therefore, Sehr silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to user the

system of Sehr to generate a specialized system because it would allow the user to

confirm or revise input ballot to match his or her accurate intent.

Sehr also does not disclose printing an official ballot, a receipt to be retained by the

eligible voter and scanning the completed ballot, but it is well known in the art to use the

printer and scan to print out records for specific event during the election (see col. 15,

lines 50-52 and col. 20, lines 54-56, McClure). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the scanner printer as

an input and output device in the system of Sehr in order to print out voting information.

Regarding claims 31-33, Sehr/ McClure further discloses the method of assigning a

unique identifier to the eligible voter (see col. 7, lines 54-58, Sehr); causing the unique identifier

to be printed on the receipt and the official ballot (see col. 7, lines 60-66, Sehr); updating a

voting results database with the ballot received from the eligible voter (col. 6, lines 57-64, Sehr);

providing access to the voting results database to the eligible voter; and requiring the eligible

voter to input the unique identifier in order to gain access to the voting results database (see col.

8, lines 3-10, Sehr).

4.   Claims 12-19 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sehr (U. S. Patent no. 5,875,432) of record in view of Bayer et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,311,190) of

record.

Regarding claim 12, Sehr discloses a method of gathering information about a user using

a computer, comprising:

-   verifying that the user is eligible to participate by consulting a first database (see col.

    6, lines 19-31, Sehr);

-   assigning a unique identifier to an eligible user (see 7, lines 54-66, Sehr). "a secret

    certification number" corresponds to "unique identifier";

-   requiring the eligible user to provide to the computer a response to the questionnaire

    (see col. 6, lines 21-24, Sehr);

-   producing a first tangible record of the response to the questionnaire (see col. 4, lines

    53-56 and Fig. 1, Sehr). The "Tabulation center" produce a first tangible record;

-   producing a second tangible record of the response (see col. 4, lines 56-59 and Fig. 1,

    Sehr). The "Certification center" product a second tangible record;

-   collecting the second tangible record (see col. 6, lines 35-44, Sehr).; and

-   storing the second tangible record. The second tangible record has been produced and

    collected during the voting process and/or survey is stored in the second database (30,

    Fig.1, Sehr).

Sehr does not explicitly disclose "Confirming that the second tangible record represents

accurate user intent". Sehr, however, discloses the voting template, which corresponds to

the tangible record, displays on the computer screen (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Sehr) and

display cloices for the user to select (see Fig. 4 of Sehr) or make his or her choices that he

or she is going to input into the computer. It is obvious that the user must check input

information and the computer system has to provide an option for the user to revise input

to approach to final change in order to get his or her original intent. Therefore, Sehr

silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to user the system of Sehr to generate

a specialized system because it would allow the user to confirm or revise his or her input

ballot to match his or her accurate intent.

Sehr also does not disclose "customizing a questionnaire". Bayer, on the other hand,

discloses "building registration questionnaires and recording the results of the

questionnaires" (see abstract and col.4, lines 1-9, Bayer). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr to customize a

questionnaire in gathering information system. The motivation of doing so would have

been to enhance the capability of a user interface of an application program operating on

a computer (see col. 2, lines 4-6, Bayer).

Regarding claim 13, Sehr/Bayer further discloses the "rejecting users not listed in the first

database" (see col. 6, lines 16-18, Sehr).

Regarding claim 14, Sehr/Bayer further discloses inputting the response into the

computer; checking the response by comparing the response to a selected standard; rejecting the

response if the response does not meet the requirements of the selected standard; and requiring

the verified user to correct the rejected response (see col.6, lines 28-30, Bayer).

Regarding claim 15, Sehr/Bayer further discloses a single choice indicated for each

individual questionnaire item (see col. 3, lines 7-12, Bayer).

Regarding claim 16, Sehr/Bayer further discloses the first database is an identification

database comprised of user identification information (see Fig. 1, Sehr). "identification database"

corresponds to "certification center" (database 30, Fig. 1, Sehr).

Regarding claims 17-18, Sehr/Bayer further discloses the first database corresponds to an

official voter registration database (see col. 4, lines 56-59, Sehr).

Regarding claim 19, Sehr/Bayer further discloses the second database is a forms

database, the forms database being comprised of form formatting and content information (see 2,

Fig. 1, Sehr). The "tabulation center" corresponds to "form database".

Regarding claims 28 and 29, Sehr discloses an information gathering system, comprising:

- means for identifying a user (see col. 5, lines 62-67, Sehr);

- means for verifying the user's status to participate in the information gathering system

  (see col. 6, lines 21-24, Sehr);

- means for generating a unique identifier (see 7, lines 54-66, Sehr). "a secret

  certification number" in Sehr is "unique identifier" in the current claimed invention;

- means for storing the at least first response the second tangible record has been

  produced and collected during the voting process and/or survey is stored in the

  second database (database 30, Fig.1; Fig.4 and col.5,lines 59-60, Sehr). The tangible

  record is the template content displays on computer Screen.

Sehr does not explicitly disclose "tangible record and the response". Sehr, however,

discloses the voting template, which corresponds to the tangible record, displays on the

computer screen (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Sehr) and display cloices for the user to select

(see Fig. 4 of Sehr) or make his or her choices that he or she is going to input into the

computer. It is obvious that the user must check his or her input information and the

computer system has to provide an option for the user to revise his or her input to

approach to final change in order to decide that the user retains the tangible record.

Therefore, Sehr silently teaches or suggests the claimed feature. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to user the system of

Sehr to generate a specialized system because it would allow the user to confirm or revise

his or her input tangible record to match his or her accurate intent.

Sehr also does not disclose "customizing a questionnaire". Bayer, on the other hand,

discloses "building registration questionnaires and recording the results of the

questionnaires" (see abstract and col.4, lines 1-9, Bayer). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr to customize a

questionnaire in gathering information system. The motivation of doing so would have

been to enhance the language capability of a user interface of an application program

operating on a computer (see col. 2, lines 4-6, Bayer).

Conclusion

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai

Art Unit 2171

October 31, 2003

UYEN LE

AU 2171